

Application No.: 10/658236
Docket No.: UC0013USNA

Remarks

The following remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action dated November 15, 2007 in the above referenced pending application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks presented below.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9-13 and 19 are pending.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9-13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Independent claims 1 and 5 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claims 3 and 9, both of which are canceled.

New claim 20 is added, and claim 19 amended, to remove multiple dependency from previous claim 19.

Accordingly, claims 1, 5, 6, 10-13 and 19-20 are currently pending in the application after entry of the foregoing amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 1,3,5,6,9 -13 and 19

Claims 1,3,5,6,9-13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,876,0178 to Ko (hereinafter "Ko"). Ko teaches incident light reflecting off a reflective layer to lower contrast ratio of the OLED device, col. 4, lines 1-5. Adjustment of thickness of one or both of the organic layer and the transparent anode can be used to lower the contrast ratio, col. 2, lines 33-38. Neither the written description nor the drawings show or fairly suggest variations in the thickness of a single layer within a range of minimum and maximum thickness values, as in the claimed subject matter. Ko also teaches that thickness adjustment of the organic layer and/or the transparent anode is made so that the first reflected light will be 180° out of phase with second reflected light, producing destructive interference (see, e.g., claim 1). It is not at all clear from the relatively sparse disclosure in Ko that the reference and the pending claims operate according to the same principles based on the same or similar manipulations of layer thicknesses.

Further, Ko does not present a precise, predictive determination of thickness values, or ranges of values, for at least one of the first electrode, the second electrode, the hole-transport layer, the electron-transport layer, and the organic active layer. Ko would require undue experimentation in the form of repetitive testing to obtain correct thickness values, and any change in materials for any of the OLED components would require another round of undue

Application No.: 10/658236
Docket No.: UC0013USNA

experimentation. In contrast, the present invention allows the art practitioner to select a value (or range of values $d_1 - d_2$) for any or all of the first electrode, second electrode, hole-transport layer, electron-transport layer and organic active layer, to avoid a trial and error approach to reduce or eliminate reflected ambient light. The presently claimed subject matter also allows for the use of conventional materials so that novel materials whose properties are not affected by variations of thickness need not be discovered to achieve the reductions in background radiation and improvement in contrast ratio.

Applicants respectfully submit that the differences between the claimed subject matter and Ko are well beyond mere optimization of results. As detailed above, Ko does not teach or fairly suggest how the range in thicknesses of a single layer may be calculated to reduce the transmission of incident light in the manner achieved by Applicants.

Consequently, Ko fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of pending Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9-13 and 19-20. Thus, the above referenced rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the case is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have questions about the contents of this paper or the status of the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


JOHN LAMMING
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Registration No.:
Telephone: (302) 992-5877
Facsimile: (302) 892-1026

Dated: March 17, 2008